

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/611,468	STRUNK, JEFFREY L.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Katherine W Mitchell	3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W Mitchell. (3) _____.

(2) Kevin Farrell. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10/4, 7, 8/2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5772379, 3240101, 3469490, 3750523.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant called regarding 112 first paragraph rejection by previous examiner. Applicant faxed in draft Declaration for consideration of 112 first issues. However, current examiner noted that the claims do not present a problem, as the plug could be deformable but still less deformable than the substrate, and the claims do not require the plug on top of the impact surface. However, after reviewing the case, examiner researched the application and found art reading on at least some claims, and gave applicant choice of responding to present office action or having examiner withdraw action and mail new non-final action with art rejections. Applicant requested new non-final..